118954

Community Structure, Delinquency and Drug Use

A Preliminary Report of the Denver Youth Survey*

David Huizinga
Finn-Aage Esbensen
Delbert S. Elliott

Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

July 1989

*Funding for this research was provided by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (#86-JN-CX-006) with supplemental funding from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, (1R01DA05183) and from the Program on Positive Youth Development of the MacArthur Foundation. Points of view or opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of these agencies.

INTRODUCTION

Although recent delinquency and drug use research has focused on micro-level variables such as family variables, peer factors, school factors, and numerous social-psychological variables in attempts to provide explanations for these behaviors at the individual level, the social disorganization perspective has also recently received considerable attention from delinquency researchers (e.g., Bursik, 1986; Bursik and Webb, 1982; Fagan et al., 1986; Heitgard and Bursik, 1987; Johnstone, 1978, 1983; Laub, 1983; Sampson, 1985,; Sampson and Groves, 1989; Schuerman and Kobrin, 1986; Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz, 1986; Stark, 1987; Taylor and Covington, 1988). To our knowledge, however, no attempt has been made to study drug use from this macro-level approach. In this paper, we examine the extent to which community level explanations can be applied not only to delinquency but also to drug use. In this examination, the heterogeneity of areas considered to be socially disorganized and the role of factors that mediate between census data and individual behavior is considered.

Much of the criminological research and theory development of the 20th century has focused upon individual levels of explanation. Even the Durkheimian concept of anomie has been individualized by survey researchers (see, for example, the discussion in Farnworth and Leiber, 1989). The social ecology tradition of the Chicago School and of Shaw and McKay in particular has persisted, however, since its introduction and has experienced a resurgence in prominence during the recent past.

The early work of Shaw and McKay (1942), as well as replications conducted during the fifties and sixties (Lander, 1954; Bordua, 1958-59; Chilton, 1964; and Quinney, 1964), relied upon census data to measure neighborhood characteristics and upon official measures of crime and delinquency, i.e., police records, to indicate illegal activity. In a review of ecological studies, Baldwin (1979) cited the use

of official statistics as a serious weakness, noting that these data have been criticized for a variety of reasons.[1] In more recent works, however, both self-report and victimization data have been used to measure crime (e.g., Kapsis, 1978; Johnstone, 1978, 1983; Sampson, 1985; and Fagan et al., 1986).

Baldwin raised another methodological concern--that the social ecology approach erroneously assumed that social areas are homogeneous. In an early critique of Shaw and McKay's work, Jonassen (1949) had identified this as a fallacy, claiming that not all people residing in the same neighborhood have similar life experiences and that intra-area differences might exist. Both of these authors suggest that differences exist between individuals within these areas and that certain subgroups may respond differently to environmental conditions. Jonassen (1949:613), for example, points out that Shaw and McKay acknowledged that Orientals had preserved to such an extent the Old World cultures and institutions that control of the child was sufficiently effective to keep delinquency and other forms of deviant behavior at a minimum. Thus, the macro-level aspect of social disorganization theory cannot explain all variation in individual behavior--in fact, it was never intended to do so. Rather, the perspective suggests that neighborhood characteristics influence individuals residing in the neighborhood to a sufficient extent that a global characterization of the behavior of neighborhood residents (or at least some significant segment of residents) reflects that influence.

A related issue to the homogeneity of socially disorganized areas pertains to the distribution of neighborhood characteristics across areas identified as socially disorganized. This may well be associated with the fact that no precise definition of social disorganization exists. Kornhauser (1978: 20) has defined social disorganization as the inability of a community structure to realize the common values of its residents and maintain effective social controls. In practice, however, there may be many factors influencing social control, and social

disorganization has been most commonly defined in terms of the census variables selected by a researcher; and, once selected, it has often been assumed that these community descriptors are uniformly distributed among or describe all the various "socially disorganized" areas. Social ecology studies, market segmentation studies, and some delinquency research (e.g., Tryon, 1955; Cartwright and Howard, 1966; Tryon and Bailey, 1970), however, have shown that this is not usually the case and that communities or neighborhoods may be characterized by specific subsets of variables. Schuerman and Kobrin (1986) found, for example, that neighborhoods could be differentiated on four different dimensions--land use, demographic,socioeconomic, and subculture variables--and that crime rates varied according to the dominant structural characteristic of the community. To date, however, the majority of criminology researchers testing social disorganization theory have treated the concept as a homogeneous variable defined by some combination of census variables. Regardless of the operational definition employed, prior studies have corroborated the findings of Shaw and McKay that an inverse relationship exists between levels of social disorganization and official crime rates.

Another concern recently raised is that the majority of previous research utilizing the macro-level social disorganization perspective has omitted an important component of the Shaw and McKay model--the role of mediating factors between social disorganization and behavior. In their recent publication, Sampson and Groves (1989) highlight this problem. They write that "the crux of the problem is that previous macro-level research in crime and delinquency has relied primarily on census data that rarely provide measures for the variables hypothesized to mediate the relationship between community structure and crime." Two notable exceptions to this are studies reported by Johnstone (1983) and Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz (1986). Johnstone combined elements of Hirschi's social control theory

with the social disorganization approach while examining gang recruitment. He found that "the opportunity to gang is established by the external social environment, but the decision to do so is governed by social and institutional attachments and by definitions of self" (Johnstone, 1983:296). Similarly, Simcha-Fagan and Schwartz (1986) report on the importance of examining individual level variables as well as community contextual factors.

The preceding discussion raises important questions for the study of community level characteristics and behavior. First is the need to address the criticism that socially disorganized neighborhoods are not homogeneous. While previous researchers have utilized factor analytic techniques to identify the underlying dimensions of social disorganization (e.g., poverty, mobility, density), they have proceeded to treat socially disorganized areas as if they uniformly possessed the identified characteristics when, in fact, they may have quite different values on the descriptive variables used to determine social disorganization The current research follows the procedures of social area analysis employing cluster or profile analysis to determine if these qualities are differentially distributed among neighborhoods. A second issue concerns the role of mediating factors that help to explain the role of social disorganization (as defined by census data) in resulting delinquent and drug use behavior.

In an earlier paper (Esbensen and Huizinga, 1989), we found that drug use was generally evenly distributed across different socially disorganized areas, but that potential mediating factors of location of use and reasons for use varied by social area. The current paper extends this previous work to include delinquency and to examine the role of a perceived limited opportunity factor as a mediating variable between social area and delinquent or drug use behavior. The issues addressed include:

1. Do different areas labelled as socially disorganized differ in reports of perceived social problems or in levels of limited opportunity as perceived by youth;

2. Do different areas labelled as socially disorganized differ by their level of delinquency or drug use;

3. Do different levels of perceived opportunity interact differentially with different types of social areas to produce different levels of delinquency and drug use?

Much literature, including our own, has found little direct effect of measures called strain on delinquency and drug use. In this regard, the results reported here act as a very preliminary examination of a measure involved in the determination of a strain concept and whether the measure is related to social areas, delinquency or drug use.

It should also be noted that the social ecology approach used leads directly to the notions of risk and protective factors. It is assumed that some youth will experience feelings of limited opportunities and others will not, while both groups live in environments that would be expected to engender these feelings. Examining factors that lead one youth to be so affected while another is not (risk and protection) is far beyond the scope of this preliminary paper, but points the direction for promising future work.

METHODS

The research reported here is part of a longitudinal study investigating the causes and correlates of delinquency and drug use. Census data were used to identify "high risk" neighborhoods in Denver, Colorado. A random sample of households were selected and interviews were conducted with 1532 youth between the ages of 7 and 16 years and one of their parents. The data used here are self-reported measures of delinquency, drug use, perceived social problems, and limited opportunities obtained from the respondents during an hour long face-to-face confidential interview conducted in privacy in the respondent's home.

SAMPLE

Due to the design of the larger study and the need to insure sufficient numbers of serious or chronic juvenile offenders, "high risk" neighborhoods were identified from which to select prospective respondents. High risk was defined in accordance with the consistent findings of the social disorganization literature which have found higher rates of involvement in delinquent activities in neighborhoods characterized by "social disorganization". Based upon the results of earlier studies, we selected 35 variables from the 1980 census data representing seven conceptual areas: family structure, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, housing, mobility, marital status, and age composition.

A factor analysis (principal components with varimax rotation) of variables within each of these seven conceptual domains resulted in the identification of eleven distinct factors (eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and skree criteria were used in determining the number of factors). Table 1 reports the factor loadings and the variance explained by the factors within each domain. Four of the theoretically derived concepts identified above produced two distinct factors. The socioeconomic domain, for example, resulted in the identification of an upper SES (e.g., high education, household income over $40,000 and professional and managerial occupations) and a lower SES factor (e.g., families in poverty, incomes under $10,000, and laborer occupations).

A cluster analysis (K-means with iterative relocation) was subsequently run to combine and identify similar block groups of the city of Denver. Seven distinct clusters emerged, with three clusters very loosely identified in the conceptual approach as being "socially disorganized" and providing some variation in ecological characteristics. The first cluster or group of block groups is economically disadvantaged having high rates of poverty, unemployment, and high numbers of unemployed school-dropout youth. It also has a high racial mix (white,

black, and hispanic), and high rates of single parent households and persons per room (density). This cluster will be referred to as "traditional" hereafter in that it is comprised of variables generally associated with socially disorganized neighborhoods. The second cluster is also economically disadvantaged although not as severely as the first, with a highly mobile population consisting of many unmarried persons and few intact families, and many multiple unit dwellings. The third cluster is a predominantly minority cluster (black) with higher than average rates of single parent and unmarried person households, and high rates of persons per room. These last two clusters will be referred to as "HU-Dense" and "black" respectively, indicative of their primary identifying features.

The geographic areas covered by these clusters include areas identified by arrest data from the Denver Police Department as having high crime rates. Using arrest data, we identified those neighborhoods within the socially disorganized areas that were in the upper one-third of the crime distribution.[2] These socially disorganized high crime areas became the neighborhoods for inclusion in the study sample.

SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

The overall design of the research project is based on a prospective sequential longitudinal survey. The longitudinal survey involves a sequence of annual personal interviews with a probability sample of five different birth cohorts selected from the areas of high risk for delinquency. At the point of the first annual survey, the birth cohorts were 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 years of age. Assuming the period effects between adjacent cohorts are not too large, the use of these birth cohorts (samples) results in overlapping age ranges during the course of the study that will allow examination of developmental sequences across the full age span from 7 to 17.

To select the individuals to be included in the sample of each of the five birth cohorts, a probability sample of households based on a stratified sampling design of the selected neighborhoods was used. Within the group of selected households, identification of those that contained an eligible respondent (i.e., households that contained a 7, 9, 11, 13, or 15 year old person) was accomplished by an initial screening questionnaire.

A full enumeration of the high risk neighborhoods was conducted. Based upon estimated vacancy and completion rates, a sample of approximately 20,300 households were selected for an initial screening phase. The sampling procedure resulted in completed interviews with 1532 youths distributed across the five cohorts (a completion rate of 85% among identified eligible youth). A summary of the sample characteristics is given in Table 2.

MEASURES

The measures used in this report include: (1) perceived neighborhood problems; (2) perceived limited opportunities; and (3) self-reported delinquency and drug use. Each of these is briefly described.

Perceived Neighborhood Problems. This measure is taken from information provided by parents concerning problems they perceived in their neighborhoods. Example items include problems of high unemployment, vandalism, organized crime, delinquent gangs, rundown buildings, abandoned houses, availability of medical services, unsupervised children, and availability of police. A factor analysis of this 31 item measure indicated four underlying constructs: (1) teenager and child related problems (e.g., teenage pregnancy, unsupervised youth and children, delinquent gangs); (2) crime (e.g., assaults, prostitution, organized crime); (3) service problems (e.g., poor schools, police not available, medical services not available); (4) and disorder problems (e.g., vandalism, lawlessness, racial conflict).

Perceived Limited Opportunities. This 14 item scale is an adaptation of a scale developed by Landis et al. (1963) and measures individuals' perceptions of limited opportunities for the attainment of conventional goals. The items measure such factors as the likelihood of educational success, the role of family and neighborhood in limiting likelihood for success, and the perception of an individuals economic well-being. A shortened and simplified version of the scale consisted of 6-items was used for the youngest two cohorts. The reliabilities for the youth and child scales are moderate, .78 and .56, respectively.

Self-reported Delinquency and Drug Use. The self-report delinquency and drug use measures obtain information about involvement in 39 delinquent acts (26 for 7 and 9 year olds) and use of 16 drugs (6 for the 7 and 9 year olds). Age of initiation, frequency of participation or use in the last year, and detailed followup information is obtained. For this paper only the last year prevalence and frequency data are used and items are categorized into the following summary measures: For delinquency--Total Delinquency, Assault, Theft, Robbery, Burglary, Fraud, Status, Disorderly Conduct, Drug Sales (not available for 7 and 9 year olds), Property Damage, Arson, and for drug use--Tobacco, Alcohol, Marijuana, and for the older cohorts, Other Drugs (tranquilizers, barbiturates, amphetamines, hallucinogens, cocaine, crack, heroin, PCP).

RESULTS

The first point of interest is to reiterate the fact that three distinct types of socially disorganized areas were found in the sampling procedure. These areas are not homogeneous. Different neighborhood descriptors describe different types of social disorganization. While the three derived clusters can all be described as socially disorganized, different patterns of variables characterize each cluster. Thus while the "traditional" cluster consists of block groups with a concentration of unemployed people, persons working as laborers and service

workers, single parents and other single persons, high racial mix, and a high per unit density, the "dense" cluster shares only the occupation and single persons variables. Similarly, few of the identifying characteristics of the "dense" cluster are shared by the "black" cluster. Having identified these different types of socially disorganized areas, the next issue of concern is to determine if different patterns of behavior and perceptions exist in these areas and if mediating factors help to explain the relationship between community characteristics and behavior.

NEIGHBORHOOD PROBLEMS

No substantive differences between the social areas on teenage-child, crime, service availability, and general disorder problems were found. As illustrated in Table 3, the three social areas are very similar in terms of the mean and standard deviation of the various problem scales. (Although some inter-area differences are statistically significant, the significance results from the excessive power available for an ANOVA test.) The levels of problems reported indicate a similar and moderate level of perceived problems exists in all social areas. Thus, while there are differences in the social ecology of the areas, the residents (more precisely, the parents of the 7-15 year old youth) of these areas report the same levels and patterns of area problems. In related analyses, similar findings were found when the social areas were disaggregated into smaller contiguous city planning neighborhoods, so these findings appear to hold across different levels of geographic aggregation.

PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY

The perceived limited opportunity reported by youth and children indicates small differences between the social areas (see Table 3). Among youth (ages 11-15) the Traditional area has a slightly higher mean level of perceived limited opportunity, a difference that is statistically significant at the .001 level, but

one that substantively is at best moderate involving only a few points on a 65 point scale. An examination of the general distribution by breaking the distribution into thirds (high, medium, and low) reveals a similar finding, with 36 percent of the youth in the traditional area falling in the high range and roughly 20 percent of the other two areas falling in that range. For children, mean differences on the limited opportunity measure are slight and not significant, although there are some differences in the overall distribution, with the Traditional area having the highest percentage of children in the high range of the distribution. Thus, overall it appears there is a slightly larger level of perceived limited opportunity among youth and children in the Traditional area, but it should be emphasized that the differences between areas is relatively small.

DELINQUENCY, DRUG USE AND LIMITED OPPORTUNITY

The self-reported delinquency and drug use measures for the social areas and for levels of perceived opportunity within social area are given for the total sample and by sex in Tables 4-15. Both prevalence and offender-user frequency rates are given. The levels of low, medium, and high limited opportunity represent roughly thirds for the youth tables (ages 11-15) and represent 30, 50, and 20 percent respectively, for the child tables, reflecting somewhat fewer children in the upper range of the distribution.

Examination of these tables indicates that while there are not statistical differences between social areas in overall proportion (prevalence) of youth or children engaged in various delinquent acts (as represented by the Total Delinquency Scale), there are differences for certain kinds of delinquencies and drug use. For example, for youth there are substantial and significant differences for theft, fraud, and alcohol use. Male youths also show a difference on robbery and females on tobacco use. It should be noted, however, that the highest prevalence rates for different offenses are not unique to any one area so that the

social areas appear to have some variation in prevalence patterns of delinquency and drug use.

For the children of these areas (ages 7-9) there is again difference in prevalence rates across the social areas in status offenses, disorderly conduct, arson, robbery, and alcohol use. The highest rates for these offenses is almost always in the Black social area. These overall findings are replicated for boys, but not for girls, suggesting a sex difference in social area effects.

Roughly similar findings hold in examination of frequency of offending and drug use among active offenders or users. Differences between social areas are found for many types of delinquency and drug use, and for children the highest frequency rates are almost always found in the Black area. (It should be noted that these offending/use rates are easily affected by outliers, so that a few individuals reporting high frequencies may strongly affect computed rates.)

Overall, it appears that there are differences between the social areas in the patterns of prevalence and frequency of involvement in various delinquent acts and drug use. The interested reader is encouraged to further examine the tables about this issue. For the purpose of this paper, however, the focus is shifted to the relationship between social areas, perceived limited opportunities, and delinquency and drug use. It was earlier observed that there was little difference between the social areas in levels of perceived limited opportunities. The question thus becomes, is the relationship between limited opportunities and delinquency or drug use similar across areas. It might be anticipated that socially disorganized areas engender feelings of limited opportunities which in turn (perhaps due to a perceived blockage to conventional goals) lead to or increase the chance of delinquency and drug use, and further that this process should operate uniformly across different social areas.

Examination of Tables 4-15, however, suggests that this is not the case, at least when applied to specific offenses. For example, although youth theft follows the expected pattern of increased involvement with increasing levels of perceived limited opportunity across all areas, this pattern does not hold consistently for fraud or alcohol use in the HU-Dense or Black areas. Other examples are readily found in the tables, and there is some evidence of both age (e.g., status offenses) and sex (e.g., Child Total Delinquency) differences. This is further illustrated in data not presented in which the multiple R^2 between perceived opportunities and theft is .35 in the HU-Dense area for female youth while the corresponding R^2 is less than .06 for any other group, male or female, in any social area.

Overall, it would appear that the relationship between limited opportunity and delinquency or drug use is not constant across social areas, and may be complex involving social area, age, and sex interactions. Although this is a preliminary finding, and related work is in progress, it would appear that an assumption of a uniform effect of perceived limited opportunity as a mediating variable between census characteristics of neighborhoods and individual behavior may not be appropriate.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In answering the three questions initially posed, it appears that the different social areas are quite similar in the kinds and levels of perceived social problems. Teenager and children problems, crime problems, service availability problems, and general disorder problems provided moderate and similar patterns across the social areas. There was a slight difference across the social areas in levels of perceived limited opportunity by youth and children, with slightly higher levels perceived by youngsters in the Traditional area. This difference was small, however, and in general the areas would be considered quite similar on this measure.

Some differences between areas was found for certain types of delinquency and drug use, both in terms of prevalence and offender/user frequency rates. Also, of particular interest, the role of perceived limited opportunity as a mediating variable between social areas identified through census data and individual behavior appears to involve a complex interaction between type of behavior, social area, age, and sex.

If these preliminary findings are further buttressed by additional efforts in this area, they raise a number of theoretical and practical analytical issues that are beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, they do suggest the importance of examining subgroups of youth and the need for caution in testing monolithic theories of delinquency as applied to all youth or children. These findings also suggest that there may be different influences on residents living in different social areas characterized as socially disorganized with high crime rates. There is thus some evidence of the importance of recognizing the heterogeneity of socially disorganized areas in examining reasons underlying delinquent and drug use behavior.

NOTES

1. For a review of measurement problems attributed to official data, consult the discussion provided by Menard (1987) or Menard and Covey (1988).
2. It should be clarified that a number of block groups defined as socially disorganized did not have high crime rates and were, therefore, excluded from the sample. Conversely, block groups with high crime rates yet not socially disorganized according to our analysis were also excluded from the high risk sample.

Table 1

NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPTUAL FACTOR ANALYSIS

Concept I. Family Structure: 4 variables = 2 factors		71.4% of variance
Factor #1: Family Household	Factor 1	Factor 2
Nonfamily Household	-.80	-.15
Married Couple with Children	.79	.19
Households Without own Children	.66	-.50
Factor #2: Single Parent Household		
Single Parent Families	.20	.88
Concept II. Ethnicity (Racial Mix) = 2 factors		68.9% of variance
Factor #3: Ethnic Diversity	Factor 3	Factor 4
Racial Diversity	.85	.18
Percent Hispanic	.83	.02
Percent Other	.59	-.04
Factor #4: Predominantly Black		
Percent Black	-.04	.92
Percent White	-.13	-.87
Concept III. Socioeconomic: 11 variables = 2 factors		67.6% of variance
Factor #5: High SES	Factor 5	Factor 6
Median Education	.87	.25
Higher Education	.86	-.23
Median Household Income	.84	-.26
Professional and Managerial	.86	-.25
House Value	.72	-.30
Households over $40,000	.74	-.35
Factor #6: Low SES		
Service and Laborer	-.20	.80
Households under $10,000	-.22	.82
Families in Poverty	-.20	.76
Unemployed	-.05	.73
Unemployed School Dropouts	-.12	.55
Concept IV. Housing: 5 variables = 2 factors		75.3% of variance
Factor #7: Rental	Factor 7	Factor 8
Renter Occupied	.88	.10
Vacant Housing Units	.76	.07
Dwelling Unit Density	.91	-.21
Factor #8: Housing Density		
Median Persons per Household	-.29	.81
Household Density	.31	.80

Concept V. Mobility: 3 variables = 1 factor 66.1% of variance

Factor #9: Mobility	Factor 9
Tenure at Current Address	.86
Mobility Outside County	.87
No Mobility	-.68

Concept VI. Marital Status: 4 variables = 1 factor 50% of variance.

Factor #10: Non-Married	Factor 10
Percent Married	-.53
Percent Single	.67
Percent Separated	.76
Percent Divorced	.81

Concept VII. Population Composition: 3 variables = 1 factor 79.6 % of variance.

Factor #11: Aged	Factor 11
Percent Persons 65 and Over	.94
Mean Age	.86
Percent Widowed	.86

Table 2

Percent of DYS Respondents
Ever Using Alcohol, Marijuana, and Other Drugs - 1988

	Race				Sex		Year of Birth[1]					Cluster		
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Male	Female	72	74	76	78	80	Trad	Dense	Black
N	153	549	646	181	801	728	270	301	330	315	343	864	230	439
Percent	10%	36%	42%	12%	52%	48%	18%	20%	20%	21%	22%	56%	15%	29%

[1]Year of birth is used to represent the 15, 13, 11, 9 and 7 year old cohorts.

Table 3

Neighborhood Problems
by Social Area

	SOCIAL AREA					
	Traditional		HU-Dense		Black	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Problems						
Teen & Child Related	20.8	6.7	19.9	5.9	21.7	6.6
Crime	12.2	4.7	12.0	4.0	11.9	4.5
Services Unavailable	10.9	4.0	10.1	3.1	10.9	3.5
Disorder	9.7	3.1	9.3	2.8	9.2	3.0
Total	53.6	16.2	51.3	13.5	53.7	15.6

	LIMITED OPPORTUNITY SOCIAL AREA					
	Traditional		HU-Dense		Black	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Perceived Limited Opportunity						
By Youth	35.8	6.3	32.6	6.8	32.9	6.5
By Child	1.7	0.7	1.8	0.6	1.6	0.6

TABLE 4.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR YOUTH 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	25.2	20.7	28.1	24.5	26.2	23.1	17.7	23.5	24.3	34.2	25.9	27.9	25.3
THEFT	21.0	24.9	39.3	29.0	16.3	11.5	23.5	16.3	14.4	23.4	24.1	19.6	25.2
ROBBERY	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.2	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.4	0.3
BURGLARY	6.7	6.9	10.2	8.0	4.9	11.5	5.9	7.1	5.8	7.8	3.7	6.0	7.4
FRAUD	18.5	23.5	31.1	24.9	34.2	30.8	17.7	29.8	30.8	37.3	32.1	33.2	27.6
STATUS	29.5	29.3	31.6	30.2	26.2	23.1	52.9	30.6	31.1	45.5	35.2	36.8	32.0
DISORDERLY	16.1	13.8	28.4	19.7	29.3	15.4	41.2	27.4	18.3	27.3	27.8	23.4	21.4
PROPRTY DMGE	7.4	5.4	10.7	7.8	11.6	3.4	11.8	9.3	7.7	15.6	7.4	16.2	8.6
DRUG SALES	2.7	3.4	3.1	3.1	0.0	3.9	0.0	1.2	0.0	11.4	23.1	1.7	2.5
ARSON	1.3	1.5	3.5	2.2	2.3	3.8	5.9	3.5	0.0	0.0	9.3	2.1	2.3
TOT DELINQ	70.4	68.9	76.2	72.0	61.0	73.1	76.5	67.9	74.5	77.0	75.0	75.4	72.5
TOBACCO	8.0	7.8	16.2	10.9	9.3	11.5	17.6	11.6	3.9	9.1	7.4	6.4	9.7
ALCOHOL	33.8	33.5	35.7	34.4	48.8	50.0	35.3	46.5	37.5	40.3	31.5	37.0	36.3
MARIJUANA	11.3	11.2	19.9	14.3	11.6	7.7	23.5	12.8	7.7	14.3	11.1	10.6	13.2
OTHER DRUGS	23.4	16.4	15.7	18.0	25.6	11.5	35.3	23.2	21.4	15.6	3.9	15.5	17.8

TABLE 5.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR MALES 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	30.9	30.3	32.7	31.3	21.1	18.8	18.2	19.6	20.8	44.7	41.4	33.9	30.8
THEFT	22.2	31.8	42 3	32.9	25.0	12.5	9.1	17.0	8.3	33.3	34.5	23.3	28.8
ROBBERY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
BURGLARY	6.0	7.3	11.5	8.5	11.1	12.5	0.0	8.9	6.3	12.8	6.9	8.6	8.5
FRAUD	22.2	28.2	31.4	27.7	27.8	25.0	0.0	20.0	33.3	41.0	39.3	37.4	29.4
STATUS	35.4	34.2	24.0	31.0	31.6	12.5	45.5	28.3	33.3	46.2	37.9	38.8	32.7
DISORDERLY	17.7	10.0	28.6	18.7	33.3	18.8	27.3	26.7	18.8	35.9	34.5	28.5	22.0
PROPRTY DMGE	12.0	5.5	12.5	9.8	20.0	6.3	9.1	12.8	10.4	23.1	10.3	14.7	11.3
DRUG SALES	3.6	4.5	3.9	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	10.3	3.5	3.5
ARSON	2.4	2.7	6.7	4.0	5.0	6.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	10.3	2.6	3.7
TOT DELINQ	78.1	72.4	79.4	76.4	55.6	75.0	63.6	64.4	81.3	79.0	85.2	81.4	76.5
TOBACCO	7.3	7.3	10.5	8.4	5.0	0.0	18.2	6.4	2.1	12.8	10.3	7.8	8.0
ALCOHOL	31.3	34.2	32.7	32.9	40.0	43.8	18.2	36.2	29.2	46.2	37.9	37.1	34.3
MARIJUANA	9.8	9.0	17.3	12.1	10.0	0.0	18.2	8.5	6.3	15.4	17.2	12.1	11.7
OTHER DRUGS	19.2	13.0	17.8	16.4	20.0	12.5	27.3	19.2	19.2	15.4	3.6	14.0	16.1

TABLE 6.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR FEMALES 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	18.2	9.6	22.8	16.7	30.4	30.0	16.7	28.2	27.3	23.7	8.0	22.0	19.3
THEFT	19.4	16.8	35.9	24.4	8.7	10.0	50.0	15.4	19.6	13.2	12.0	16.0	21.1
ROBBERY	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.8	0.5
BURGLARY	7.5	6.3	8.7	7.5	0.0	10.0	16.7	5.1	5.4	2.6	0.0	3.4	6.1
FRAUD	13.9	18.1	30.8	21.6	39.1	40.0	50.0	41.0	28.6	33.3	24.0	29.1	25.6
STATUS	22.4	23.4	40.2	29.3	21.7	40.0	66.7	33.3	29.1	44.7	32.0	34.8	31.2
DISORDERLY	14.1	18.1	28.3	20.8	26.1	10.0	66.7	28.2	17.9	18.4	20.0	18.5	20.8
PROPRTY DMGE	1.5	5.3	8.7	5.5	4.4	0.0	16.7	5.1	5.4	7.9	4.0	5.9	5.6
DRUG SALES	1.5	2.1	2.2	2.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5
ARSON	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	2.6	0.0	0.0	8.0	1.7	0.7
TOT DELINQ	61.3	64.8	72.5	66.8	65.2	70.0	100.0	71.8	68.5	75.0	64.0	69.6	68.1
TOBACCO	8.9	8.4	22.8	13.7	13.0	30.0	16.7	18.0	5.4	5.3	4.0	5.0	11.6
ALCOHOL	36.8	32.6	39.1	36.1	56.5	60.0	66.7	59.0	44.6	34.2	24.0	37.0	38.5
MARIJUANA	13.2	13.7	22.8	16.9	13.0	20.0	33.3	18.0	8.9	13.2	4.0	9.2	14.8
OTHER DRUGS	28.6	20.4	13.3	19.9	30.4	10.0	50.0	28.2	23.2	15.8	4.2	17.0	19.9

TABLE 7.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR YOUTH 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	49.7	42.4	52.9	47.2	35.3	62.7	23.1	49.1	44.3	62.7	50.0	53.1	48.8
THEFT	13.8	21.0	30.0	18.9	6.9	30.8	30.0	23.1	7.4	28.3	40.0	19.7	19.8
ROBBERY	2.2	4.4	1.8	3.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	4.6	3.1	10.9	8.3	7.1	4.2
BURGLARY	5.0	8.2	1.8	5.8	2.8	9.8	14.3	8.1	3.1	10.9	0.0	6.5	6.4
FRAUD	10.3	13.0	9.4	11.2	8.0	13.7	36.4	14.9	4.9	9.5	44.4	10.9	11.9
STATUS	15.2	15.1	23.5	16.2	4.0	14.6	10.0	10.8	14.0	20.9	40.0	19.4	16.0
DISORDERLY	3.9	7.6	1.8	5.1	0.0	6.6	0.0	3.6	6.3	14.3	8.3	10.1	5.9
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	13.7	12.6	23.3	14.5	4.0	12.5	0.0	8.5	4.4	31.0	11.1	16.7	13.8
ARSON	2.2	1.3	0.0	1.5	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.9	3.1	7.8	0.0	5.0	2.2
TOT DELINQ	67.5	61.5	70.8	65.7	44.4	70.3	71.4	62.9	58.6	71.4	60.0	64.5	64.9
TOBACCO	1.7	1.9	0.0	1.5	0.0	3.3	0.0	1.8	1.5	1.6	16.7	2.9	1.9
ALCOHOL	10.5	12.0	9.3	10.9	17.7	19.0	7.7	17.1	17.5	23.0	27.3	20.7	14.1
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
OTHER DRUGS													

TABLE 8.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR MALES 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	57.5	46.3	59.3	53.2	38.9	63.3	28.6	50.9	70.8	66.7	75.0	68.8	55.9
THEFT	17.8	29.7	40.0	25.5	6.3	32.1	25.0	22.9	14.3	33.3	50.0	26.8	25.3
ROBBERY	3.9	2.4	0.0	2.8	0.0	12.5	0.0	7.0	7.4	13.1	0.0	10.1	5.0
BURGLARY	8.0	11.0	3.3	8.5	5.6	12.5	14.3	10.5	7.7	10.5	0.0	8.8	8.9
FRAUD	12.7	17.3	11.1	14.3	6.7	12.0	20.0	11.1	5.3	8.3	50.0	8.9	12.6
STATUS	13.2	21.6	21.1	17.4	0.0	15.4	0.0	9.3	18.2	20.0	33.3	20.0	16.5
DISORDERLY	5.0	9.6	3.3	6.5	0.0	9.4	0.0	5.3	3.7	18.4	0.0	11.6	7.4
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	20.6	14.0	17.7	17.7	0.0	16.0	0.0	9.3	4.8	38.5	0.0	22.0	17.0
ARSON	2.9	1.2	0.0	1.9	5.6	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	10.5	0.0	5.9	2.7
TOT DELINQ	83.7	70.3	71.4	76.6	50.0	64.7	66.7	60.0	78.6	70.6	100.0	75.0	73.1
TOBACCO	2.9	2.4	0.0	2.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	3.5	0.0	2.7	25.0	2.9	2.7
ALCOHOL	13.9	10.8	10.3	12.2	18.8	22.6	0.0	18.9	22.2	31.4	25.0	27.3	16.3
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
OTHER DRUGS													

TABLE 9.

PREVALENCE OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR FEMALES 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	40.0	38.0	45.9	40.0	31.3	62.1	16.7	47.1	27.0	56.5	33.3	37.9	40.8
THEFT	9.2	10.9	20.0	11.4	7.7	29.2	33.3	23.3	3.0	20.0	28.6	11.7	13.6
ROBBERY	0.0	6.6	3.9	3.3	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.9	0.0	7.7	0.0	2.8	2.9
BURGLARY	1.2	5.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	6.9	14.3	5.6	0.0	11.5	0.0	4.2	3.6
FRAUD	7.4	8.3	7.1	7.8	10.0	15.4	50.0	19.1	4.6	11.1	33.3	10.9	10.8
STATUS	17.5	9.1	26.7	15.0	7.7	13.6	20.0	12.5	10.7	22.2	33.3	17.3	15.1
DISORDERLY	2.6	5.3	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.5	0.0	1.9	8.1	8.0	0.0	7.3	4.0
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	5.6	11.1	30.8	10.7	9.1	8.8	0.0	7.7	4.2	18.8	0.0	8.9	9.7
ARSON	1.2	1.3	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	3.9	0.0	4.2	1.6
TOT DELINQ	48.7	50.0	70.0	52.0	37.5	75.0	75.0	65.6	40.0	72.7	50.0	53.3	55.5
TOBACCO	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.7
ALCOHOL	6.3	13.2	8.0	9.4	16.7	14.8	14.3	15.4	13.9	11.5	16.7	13.2	11.3
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OTHER DRUGS													

TABLE 10.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR YOUTH 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	7.1	10.7	4.9	7.3	6.1	5.0	4.0	5.5	7.6	5.1	11.9	7.5	7.2
THEFT	3.7	14.2	5.9	8.1	4.1	10.3	9.5	7.0	5.6	3.4	2.7	3.9	7.2
ROBBERY	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.3
BURGLARY	2.5	72.6	3.5	25.3	2.5	1.0	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.7	1.5	2.0	17.9
FRAUD	5.3	3.9	5.2	4.7	[illegible].2	2.9	2.0	5.8	7.3	4.0	5.9	5.8	5.2
STATUS	8.3	7.6	8.2	8.0	27.5	7.7	2.2	14.2	37.3	16.9	4.3	21.7	12.8
DISORDERLY	3.6	9.6	16.0	11.7	9.6	3.5	4.6	7.0	2.8	5.8	77.8	24.4	14.9
DRUG SALES	6.5	70.9	86.2	61.1	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	204.0	76.0	108.0	67.0
PROPRTY DMGE	3.1	14.6	2.4	5.7	6.2	3.0	1.5	4.6	3.0	1.8	1.8	2.2	4.5
ARSON	2.0	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.5
TOT DELINQ	15.3	37.8	33.6	30.5	37.2	34.8	18.5	32.1	28.4	31.1	57.2	35.8	32.2
TOBACCO	176.2	112.1	173.1	157.4	419.8	123.3	188.0	261.3	30.3	5.4	251.5	77.7	155.6
ALCOHOL	10.3	25.8	14.9	17.7	12.6	3.7	4.0	8.4	12.9	14.7	34.2	17.7	16.5
MARIJUANA	9.1	77.2	32.7	40.6	2.0	100.5	4.8	20.9	38.3	21.9	171.5	62.7	43.5
OTHER DRUGS	37.0	18.0	7.4	21.2	14.9	1.3	2.3	9.1	7.1	70.2	366.0	48.1	26.0

TABLE 11.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR MALES 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	9.5	12.8	4.4	8.8	9.0	7.0	1.0	6.6	2.1	5.5	13.0	6.9	8.1
THEFT	3.2	18.3	6.5	10.1	5.2	7.5	5.0	5.8	13.0	3.2	3.2	4.7	8.7
ROBBERY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0
BURGLARY	2.8	126.0	3.9	42.8	2.5	1.0	0.0	1.8	4.0	1.8	1.5	2.4	28.2
FRAUD	6.8	4.2	5.4	5.2	14.2	3.5	0.0	9.4	6.4	3.9	8.3	6.0	5.8
STATUS	8.1	6.8	9.2	7.9	13.5	3.5	2.0	7.5	6.4	29.2	5.6	15.4	10.1
DISORDERLY	4.2	18.4	22.2	16.9	15.8	3.7	2.7	9.5	4.0	4.4	14.9	7.5	12.9
DRUG SALES	7.7	92.6	128.3	83.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	204.0	76.0	108.0	89.4
PROPRTY DMGE	2.9	9.3	2.9	4.2	7.5	3.0	2.0	5.8	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.6	3.9
ARSON	2.0	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.4
TOT DELINQ	15.4	54.6	38.7	38.1	54.4	15.1	17.7	29.3	13.3	43.2	43.4	30.6	35.3
TOBACCO	63.0	64.9	90.4	75.6	15.0	0.0	280.0	191.7	10.0	6.4	334.0	116.0	94.9
ALCOHOL	8.3	28.9	22.5	21.2	15.9	3.6	4.5	9.5	6.2	21.7	52.1	24.4	20.8
MARIJUANA	7.9	127.8	44.8	59.6	4.0	3.0	5.0	4.0	1.3	36.0	205.4	89.1	63.1
OTHER DRUGS	73.7	11.7	6.3	29.4	1.8	1.5	1.3	1.6	5.0	134.0	730.0	98.7	41.3

TABLE 12.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR FEMALES 11-15

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	2.1	3.0	5.9	4.2	4.4	3.0	10.0	4.5	11.3	4.3	5.0	8.4	5.6
THEFT	4.4	5.3	5.1	5.0	1.5	16.0	11.0	8.7	2.9	3.8	1.0	2.8	4.8
ROBBERY	0.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	4.5
BURGLARY	2.2	1.5	2.8	2.2	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.9
FRAUD	2.2	3.2	5.0	4.0	4.9	2.3	2.0	3.7	8.1	4.2	1.7	5.6	4.5
STATUS	8.7	9.0	7.6	8.2	44.4	9.8	2.5	20.8	68.1	3.8	2.4	28.6	16.0
DISORDERLY	2.6	4.0	8.8	6.2	3.3	3.0	6.0	4.3	1.8	8.4	203.6	50.0	17.2
PROPRTY DMGE	5.0	21.0	1.6	8.8	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	1.0	1.3	5.8
DRUG SALES	3.0	16.5	2.0	8.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0
ARSON	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.7
TOT DELINQ	15.1	16.1	27.3	20.4	25.7	68.6	19.3	35.1	44.4	17.7	77.0	41.9	28.3
TOBACCO	289.3	159.3	216.4	215.9	554.7	123.3	4.0	291.1	37.0	3.0	4.0	20.2	202.4
ALCOHOL	12.4	22.2	7.8	13.9	10.6	3.8	3.8	7.7	16.7	5.2	1.5	11.2	12.2
MARIJUANA	10.1	38.2	22.3	24.6	1.3	100.5	4.5	30.6	60.4	3.2	2.0	29.1	26.1
OTHER DRUGS	6.4	22.6	9.0	13.3	22.4	1.0	3.3	15.3	8.5	6.3	2.0	7.6	12.1

TABLE 13.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR YOUTH 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	14.5	9.1	5.5	11.2	13.3	12.0	19.3	12.7	9.8	32.7	4.2	21.7	13.9
THEFT	2.0	3.0	1.4	2.3	1.0	5.3	3.7	4.6	8.0	11.5	18.0	12.0	5.0
ROBBERY	1.3	1.4	2.0	1.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	1.0	9.7	4.0	7.4	3.8
BURGLARY	3.0	1.7	1.0	2.2	1.0	5.8	2.5	4.6	1.0	31.6	0.0	24.8	7.7
FRAUD	2.9	3.8	1.7	3.2	3.5	3.1	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.3
STATUS	3.6	1.7	1.3	2.4	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.2	3.3	3.2	19.5	6.5	3.5
DISORDERLY	3.6	2.8	1.0	2.9	0.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	4.0	15.0	24.0	12.5	6.5
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	3.4	2.8	2.4	3.0	1.0	5.7	0.0	5.0	1.5	19.0	90.0	21.3	8.3
ARSON	2.3	1.0	0.0	1.8	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.4	0.0	1.3	1.5
TOT DELINQ	19.3	12.2	8.9	15.1	16.6	22.7	11.4	20.0	13.6	67.7	12.0	40.5	21.5
TOBACCO	1.0	4.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	29.0	4.5	9.8	4.7
ALCOHOL	3.1	5.8	1.8	4.1	5.3	2.8	2.0	3.6	1.4	4.4	12.0	4.0	4.0
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
OTHER DRUGS													

TABLE 14.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR MALES 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	16.7	6.4	6.4	11.6	18.9	9.5	23.5	12.9	12.5	34.6	3.7	24.0	14.8
THEFT	1.5	3.2	1.5	2.3	1.0	4.7	4.0	4.3	7.3	13.9	4.0	11.9	4.8
ROBBERY	1.3	1.5	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.8	0.0	2.8	1.0	3.4	0.0	2.7	2.2
BURGLARY	3.3	1.7	1.0	2.3	1.0	4.0	3.0	3.3	1.0	52.5	0.0	35.1	9.1
FRAUD	2.8	4.8	1.0	3.5	6.0	4.7	1.0	4.2	3.0	2.0	2.0	2.3	3.5
STATUS	4.9	1.8	1.5	2.9	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	4.3	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.1
DISORDERLY	3.8	2.4	1.0	2.8	0.0	3.3	0.0	3.3	7.0	18.4	0.0	17.0	7.4
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	3.3	3.1	2.0	3.1	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	24.1	0.0	22.0	8.8
ARSON	2.7	1.0	0.0	2.3	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	1.8
TOT DELINQ	22.1	13.0	10.6	17.2	23.4	24.9	9.5	22.8	17.4	94.4	18.0	55.9	26.3
TOBACCO	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	29.0	2.0	15.5	4.2
ALCOHOL	2.7	2.0	1.0	2.3	9.0	2.4	0.0	4.4	1.7	4.5	2.0	3.4	3.0
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
OTHER DRUGS													

TABLE 15.

OFFENDING/USE RATES [λ] OF DELINQUENCY AND DRUG USE
BY SOCIAL AREA AND PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY
FOR FEMALES 7-9

SOCIAL AREA	TRADITIONAL				HU-DENSE				BLACK				TOTAL
PERCEIVED LIMITED OPPORTUNITY	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	LOW	MED	HIGH	TOT	TOTAL
DELINQUENCY													
ASSAULT	10.7	12.8	4.1	10.5	5.6	14.6	11.0	12.5	5.2	29.1	5.0	17.6	12.4
THEFT	3.0	2.3	1.3	2.3	1.0	6.0	3.5	5.0	10.0	4.8	1.5	4.6	3.6
ROBBERY	0.0	1.4	2.0	1.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	25.5	0.0	25.5	6.8
BURGLARY	1.0	1.8	0.0	1.6	0.0	9.5	2.0	7.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	3.6
FRAUD	3.3	1.8	3.0	2.6	1.0	2.0	3.3	2.4	4.0	5.5	4.0	4.6	3.0
STATUS	2.4	1.0	1.0	1.7	4.0	2.3	2.0	2.6	2.0	2.3	2.0	2.1	2.0
DISORDERLY	3.0	3.5	0.0	3.3	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	3.0	3.1
DRUG SALES													
PROPRTY DMGE	3.7	2.2	2.8	2.8	1.0	7.0	0.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	2.9
ARSON	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
TOT DELINQ	13.5	10.6	6.4	11.2	5.3	21.0	12.7	17.6	6.7	27.6	9.0	17.4	14.3
TOBACCO	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.5
ALCOHOL	4.0	9.1	3.0	6.9	1.7	3.5	2.0	2.6	1.0	4.3	1.0	2.1	4.6
MARIJUANA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
OTHER DRUGS													

References

Bachman, Jerald G., Lloyd D. Johnston, and Patrick M. O'Malley (1986) Monitoring the Future 1986. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan.

Baldwin, John (1979) "Ecological and Areal Studies in Great Britain and the United States." Pp. 29-66 in Crime and Justice. An Annual Review of Research, Volume 1 by Norval Morris and Michael Tonry (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bordua, David J. (1958-59) "Juvenile Delinquency and 'Anomie': An Attempt at Replication." Social Problems 6:230-38.

Brook, Judith S., Irving F. Lukoff, and Martin Whiteman (1980) "Initiation into Adolescent Marijuana Use." The Journal of Genetic Psychology 137:133-142.

Brook, Judith S., Irving F. Lukoff, and Martin Whiteman (1977) "Peer, Family and Personality Domains as Related to Adolescents' Drug Behavior." Psychological Reports 41:1095-1102.

Bursik, Robert J., Jr. (1986) "Ecological Stability and the Dynamics of Delinquency." Pp 35-66 in Crime and Community by Albert J. Reiss and Michael H. Tonry (eds.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bursik, Robert J., Jr. and Jim Webb (1982) "Community Change and Patterns of Delinquency." American Journal of Sociology 88:24-42.

Cartwright, Desmond S. and Ken Howard (1966) "Multivariate Analysis of Gang Delinquency: Ecological Influences." Multivariate Behavioral Research, July:321-371.

Chilton, Roland J. (1964) "Continuities in Delinquency Area Research: A Comparison of Studies for Baltimore, Detroit, and Indianapolis." American Sociological Review 29:71-83.

Clayton, Richard R. (1981) "The Delinquency and Drug Use Relationship Among Adolescents: A Critical Review." Pp. 82-103 in Drug Abuse and the American Adolescent by Don J. Lettieri and Jacqueline P. Ludford (eds.). NIDA Research Mongraph 38. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Dinitz, Simon and Bettye A. Pfau-Vicent (1982) "Self-Concept and Juvenile Delinquency: An Update." Youth and Society 14(2):133-158.

Elliott, Delbert S., David Huizinga, and Suzanne S. Ageton (1985) Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Elliott, Delbert S., David Huizinga, and Scott Menard (1989) Multiple Problem Youth: Delinquency, Drug Use, and Mental Health Problems. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Fagan, Jeffrey, Elizabeth Piper, and Melinda Moore (1986) "Violent Delinquents and Urban Youth." Criminology 24:439-471.

Farnworth, Margaret and Michael J. Leiber (1989) "Strain Theory Revisited: Economic Goals, Educational Means, and Delinquency." American Sociological Review 54:263-274.

Goldstein, Paul J. (1985) "The Drugs/Violence Nexus: A Tripartite Conceptual Framework." Journal of Drug Issues 13(4): 493-506.

Heitgard, Janet L. and Robert J. Bursik, Jr. 1987 "Extracommunity Dynamics and the Ecology of Delinquency." American Journal of Sociology 92:775-787.

Huba, G. J., Joseph A. Wingard, and P. M. Bentler (1979) "Beginning Adolescent Drug Use and Peer and Adult Interaction Patterns." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 47(2):265-276.

Esbensen, Finn-Aage and David Huizinga (1989) "Comunity Structure and Drug Use: From a Social Disorganization Perspective." Under Review.

Huizinga, David (1986) "The Relationship Between Delinquent and Drug Use Behaviors in a National Sample of Youth." (In Bruce Johnson and Eric Wish (eds.) Final Report to NIJ, Narcotic and Drug Research Inc., New York.

Huizinga, David, Scott Menard, and Delbert S. Elliott (1989) "Delinquency and Drug use: Temporal and Developmental Patterns." Justice Quarterly 6.

Inciardi, James A. (1981) The Drugs - Crime Connection. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Jessor, Richard and Shirley L. Jessor (1977) Problem Behavior and Psychosocial Development: A Longitudinal Study of Youth. New York: Academic Press.

Johnstone, John W. C. (1978) "Social Class, Social Areas and Delinquency. "Sociology and Social Research 63:49-72.

Johnstone, John W. C. (1983) "Recruitment to a Youth Gang." Youth and Society 14:281-300.

Jonassen, C. T. (1949) "A Reevaluation and Critique of the Logic and Some Findings of Shaw and McKay". American Sociological Review 14:608-617.

Kandel, Denise B. (1973) "Adolescent Marijuana Use: Role of Parents and Peers." Science 181(4104):1067-1070.

Kandel, Denise B. (1974) "Inter- and Intragenerational Influences on Adolescent Marijuana Use." Journal of Social issues 30(2):107-135.

Kandel, Denise B. (1978a) "Homophily, Selection, and Socialization in Adolescent Friendships." American Journal of Sociology 84(2):427-436.

Kandel, Denise B. (1978b) "Similarity in Real-Life Adolescent Friendship Pairs." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 36(3):306-312.

Kandel, Denise B. (1978c) "On Variations in Adolescent Subcultures."Youth and Society 9 (June):373-384.

Kandel, Denise B. (1980) "Drug and Drinking Behavior Among Youth." Annual Review of Sociology 6:235-285.

Kandel, Denise B. (1982) "Epidemiological and Psychological Perspective on Adolescent Drug Use." Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry 21(4):328-347.

Kaplan, Howard B. (1985) "Testing a General Theory of Drug Abuse and Other Deviant Adaptations." Journal of Drug Issues 15(4):477-492.

Kaplan, Howard B., Steven S. Martin, and Cynthia Robbins (1982) "Application of a General Theory of Deviant Behavior: Self-Derogation and Adolescent Drug Use." Journal of Health and Social Behavior 23(December):274-294.

Kapsis, Robert E. (1978) "Residential Succession and Delinquency." Criminology 15:459-86.

Kornhauser, Ruth (1978) Social Sources of Delinquency. Chicago: University of Chicago Pres.

Lander, Bernard. (1954) Towards an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia University Press.

Landis, Judson R., Simon Dinitz, Walter C. Reckless (1963) "Implementing Two Theories of Delinquency: Value Orientation and Awareness of Limited Opportunity." Sociology and Social Research 47(July):408-416.

Laub, John H. (1983) "Urbanism, Race, and Crime." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 20:183-198.

Menard, Scott (1987) "Short-Term Trends in Crime and Delinquency: A Comparison of UCR, NCS, and Self-Report Data. Justice Quarterly 4:455-474.

Menard, Scott and Herbert C. Covey (1988) "UCR and NCS: Comparisons Over Space and Time." Journal of Criminal Justice 16:371-384.

Quinney, Richard (1964) "Crime, Delinquency, and Social Areas". Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 1:149-54.

Sampson, Robert J. (1987) "Communities and Crime". Pp. 91-114 in Positive Criminology edited by Michael Gottfredsen and Travis Hirschi. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sampson, Robert J. (1985) "Neighborhood and Crime: The Structural Determinants of Personal Victimization." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 22:7-40.

Sampson, Robert J. and W. Byron Groves (1989) "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social Disorganization Theory". American Journal of Sociology 94:774-802.

Schuerman, Leo A. and Solomon Kobrin (1986) "Community Careers in Crime". Pp. 67-100 in Crime and Community by Albert J. Reiss and Michael H. Tonry (eds.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaw, Clifford R. and Henry D. McKay (1942) Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simcha-Fagan, Ora and Joseph E. Schwartz (1986) "Neighborhood and Delinquency: An Assessment of Contextual Effects." Criminology 24:667-699.

Stark, Rodney (1987) "Deviant Places: A Theory of the Ecology of Crime. "Criminolgoy 25:841-862.

Taylor, Ralph B. and Jeanette Covington (1988) "Neighborhood Changes in Ecology and Violence." Criminology 26:553-589.

Tryon, Robert C. (1955) Identification of Social Areas by Cluster Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tryon, Robert C. and Daniel E. Bailey (1970) Cluster Analysis. New York: McGraw Hill.